## Message

From: Weaver, Kerryann [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=34F0A647F38A48D684B62F59A9143529-KWEAVER]

**Sent**: 1/29/2021 12:22:09 PM

To: Nedland, Thomas S - DNR [Thomas.Nedland@wisconsin.gov]; Norton, Eric M CIV CEMVP CEMVD (USA)

[Eric.M.Norton@usace.army.mil]

**Subject**: RE: Notes from this mornings IRT meeting - Big Hollow

Flag: Follow up

So, did Jeff tell you typically how long these wells are run?

We have a known anthropogenic disturbance likely affecting hydrology of the site. So what if they meet hydro before they start pumping (if they even meet hydro before pumping) - these are not natural conditions! The hydroperiod will not be dictated by natural cycles and conditions in the environment with the presence and use of the well. It's one thing to say it's a flashy system due to natural climatic conditions but another when it may also be dictated by the activities of the well. It would take some study to realize the effect this may have on any proposed wetland and we do not have the time or inclination to do such work. It should be on the Sponsor to address those concerns for us and let's me real, they are not going to be able to do that to our satisfaction. We do know invasive species are more tolerant of abnormal water fluctuations — and there may be other effects on species composition and wetland extent from the drawdown and fluctuation. We have non hydric soils which they hope to 'become hydric' with scrapes, and I would assume water level fluctuations and reduced soil moisture would impact this.

I appreciate this additional thought and perspective but if we did a pro and con list – we'd still be leaning con, in my mind. While this site may be a feasible restoration site for the alleviation of flooding concerns identified by the state agency, it is not a suitable compensatory mitigation site under 404.

## Rule:

- Mitigation project should be appropriately sited to ensure that natural hydrology and landscape position will support long-term sustainability.
- Mitigation plan will include the manner in which the resource functions of the compensatory mitigation
  project will address the needs of the watershed AND the practicability of accomplishing ecologically selfsustaining aquatic resource restoration.

Thanks, Kerryann

From: Nedland, Thomas S - DNR < Thomas. Nedland@wisconsin.gov>

Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:55 PM

To: Norton, Eric M CIV CEMVP CEMVD (USA) < Eric.M.Norton@usace.army.mil>; Weaver, Kerryann

<weaver.kerryann@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Notes from this mornings IRT meeting - Big Hollow

I'm struggling with this, too. Here is another thought going through my head:

Are we sure the high cap well is even an issue? The reason I ask is that the well likely won't be run until mid-June, which would provide more than enough time to meet hydrology performance standards. There would be exceptions in drought years, but the area may not meet hydrology anyway in a drought year.

What made me think of this was a conversation I had with Jeff Helmuth this afternoon. He basically said that farmers do not abandon these wells, because there is no guarantee that they will get another one approved. He confirmed that the wells are usually only run beginning in mid-June.

Just another wrinkle to think about...

## We are committed to service excellence.

Visit our survey at <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey">http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey</a> to evaluate how I did.

Tom Nedland, PWS

Wetland Mitigation Coordinator – Waterways/External Services Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

107 Sutliff Avenue, Rhinelander, WI 54501

Phone: 920-286-3739

Thomas. Nedland@Wisconsin.gov



From: Norton, Eric M CIV CEMVP CEMVD (USA) < Eric.M.Norton@usace.army.mil>

Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:45 PM

To: Weaver, Kerryann < weaver.kerryann@epa.gov>; Nedland, Thomas S - DNR < Thomas.Nedland@wisconsin.gov>

Subject: RE: Notes from this mornings IRT meeting - Big Hollow

Yeah, I am rethinking option 2 now that we received more information on the effects from the high cap well. On one hand, it appears this site is surface water driven more so than groundwater driven... but any potential inputs from groundwater wouldn't be realized with the well in place. I feel like we need to hold strong and require the well to be removed if they want to move forward with this project. Otherwise, continue to farm it and leave the regional flood infrastructure in place.

Eric

From: Weaver, Kerryann < weaver.kerryann@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:33 PM

To: Norton, Eric M CIV CEMVP CEMVD (USA) < Eric.M.Norton@usace.army.mil >; Nedland, Thomas S - DNR

<Thomas.Nedland@wisconsin.gov>

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Notes from this mornings IRT meeting - Big Hollow

Eric & Tom,

I am having a hard time with this, I know I said I would support but I am having reservations:

or 2) revise bank boundary further north and east of high cap well to avoid any influence from the well. After sponsor revises calculations using max pumping rate, any areas that would be affected should be either upland buffer (if wetland hydrology would not be achieved) or a reduced credit area (wetland, but hydrology is altered from well).

- and given Jeff's comments, if they revise the bank boundary to avoid the well - they'll lose a big chunk of site.

Thanks, Kerryann

From: Norton, Eric M CIV CEMVP CEMVD (USA) < Eric.M.Norton@usace.army.mil>

Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 2:26 PM

**To:** Nedland, Thomas S - DNR < <u>Thomas.Nedland@wisconsin.gov</u>>; Weaver, Kerryann < <u>weaver.kerryann@epa.gov</u>> **Subject:** Notes from this mornings IRT meeting - Big Hollow

Tom and Kerryann,

I summarized our discussion this morning and drafted notes for each of the items we talked about. Please let me know if I missed anything or mischaracterized our discussion on any of these points. Once we finalize our notes, I'll reach out to Jeff Kraemer (Heartland) and Dale Clark (sponsor) to set up a meeting for all of us to go through their response and provide our IRT feedback.

Thanks,

Eric Norton
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Division
2926 Post Road, Suite B
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481

Telephone: (651) 290-5879 Facsimile: (715) 345-7968 Eric.M.Norton@usace.army.mil

Information on Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program status during the COVID-19 pandemic can be found at: <a href="https://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/missions/regulatory">https://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/missions/regulatory</a>